



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## HORACE AN ATTICIST

BY M. B. OGLE

There have appeared within the past year two articles<sup>1</sup> dealing with the stylistic doctrines of Horace as they are set forth in his *Sermones*, which are written from the same point of view, follow the same line of argument, and agree, with slight differences, in their conclusions. According to the one, Vergil and Horace, in their earlier poetry, at least, adopted the plain style because they were Atticists, members of the circle of Asinius Pollio, and exponents, therefore, of the stylistic theories of that circle. According to the other, Horace wrote the tenth satire of the first book with definite reference to the dispute between the Atticists, whose stylistic theories he upholds in this satire, and the Asiatics, including Lucilius, whose stylistic theories he combats, although Horace was not an extreme Atticist, but modified "the extreme views of the Atticistic school to which he belonged." Furthermore, Calvus and Catullus are mentioned in vs. 19 of this satire because "they are leading Atticists" with whose views on the points treated in this satire Horace was in complete accord, whereas Hermogenes and the simius, mentioned in vs. 18, represent the Asiatics; hence, the word *cantare*, vs. 19, cannot have the meaning usually given to it, but must be equivalent to "satirize," as in S. 2. 1. 46.

These views, supported as they are by the *auctoritas* of two such scholars as Professor Jackson and Professor Ullman, must receive, as they deserve, serious attention, but I am not, I must confess, Atticist enough, in spite of the *auctoritas*, to accept their conclusions without at least important modifications.

That Horace in S. 1. 10 sets forth his conception of satire and the difference between his conception and that of Lucilius, that he makes clear, also, his ideas of the style in which such productions

<sup>1</sup> Jackson, "Molle atque facetum," *Harvard Studies*, XXV, 117 ff.; Ullman, "Horace, Catullus, and Tigellius," *Class. Phil.*, X (1915), 270 ff. I have expressed my doubts about the validity of the conclusions of the former in a paper which will appear in *AJP*.

should be written, no one will question. The satirist, he says in effect (vs. 10 ff.), needs wit, which Lucilius had, but he needs *brevitas*, which he did not have; he needs invective, which Lucilius had, and geniality, which Lucilius did not have; he must sometimes play the part of the orator and the poet, which Lucilius did, sometimes that of the self-restrained gentleman, which Lucilius did not do. It does not follow, however, that, because Horace employs in this passage terms which are applied by the writers on oratorical theory to the bombastic style of the Asiatics on the one hand and the simple style of the Atticists on the other, he is expressly contrasting the two and explicitly stating his preference for the latter, or that he is on this account an Atticist and the critic of Lucilius because he, "compared with the higher standards of Horace's day," was an Asiatic. An argument based on the use of words is of doubtful value in any case, but especially so here, since Horace in his other discussion of the nature and aim of his work (S. 1. 4) uses these very same terms where they cannot have reference to the stylistic theories of any school; *comis et urbanus*, 1. 4. 90, *iocosus*, 1. 4. 104. It is a question, moreover, to my mind, at least, whether we ought not to confine the terms "Atticist" and "Asiatic," as we find them employed in the literature of the last century of the Republic, to the advocates only of certain stylistic theories which were formulated in connection with grammatical-rhetorical (oratorical) studies.<sup>1</sup> However this may be, Horace in this tenth satire makes it perfectly clear that he is not writing as the mouthpiece of any particular literary group, for in vss. 81 ff. he mentions among the real *docti*, who he hopes will approve of his work, Varius and Maecenas, who certainly, from the point of view of style, cannot be classed as Atticists. That his satires should be marked by the qualities of the plain style is certainly not surprising, since he takes pains to tell us (S. 1. 4. 40 ff.) that he is not writing poetry but prose in verse form, *sermoni propiora*, and *sermo* is, according to *Auc. ad Her.* 3. 13. 23, "*oratio remissa et finitima cottidianae locutioni.*"<sup>2</sup> That this was the style which Lucilius employed Horace also makes clear; cf. S. 1. 4. 56: "*His, ego quae nunc, / olim quae scripsit Lucilius, eripias si / tempora certa modosque, et quod prius*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Hendrickson, *Class. Phil.*, I (1906), 98.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Morris' note on 1. 4. 42, and Ullman, *Class. Phil.*, VI (1911), 286 and notes.

ordine verbum est / posterius facias, . . . . non . . . . invenias etiam disiecti membra poetae"; 2. 1. 28: "me pedibus delectat claudere verba / Lucili ritu"; cf. 2. 1. 63.

These words tell us, as plainly as words can, that Lucilius, in the judgment of Horace, employed the style of ordinary conversation—the plain style, if we must call it so—and they should be sufficient evidence to refute the argument that Horace criticized Lucilius because his style was essentially that of the so-called Asiatics of Horace's day. Without this testimony of Horace, however, we should be in no doubt as to the position of Lucilius in the history of Latin style. We find applied to him, in the first place, in a work on style where we have a right to expect stylistic terms to be employed in their technical sense, the adjective *urbanus*, that shibboleth of the Atticists, a stock epithet of the plain style;<sup>1</sup> Cic. *De Or.* 1. 72: "C. Lucilius . . . . homo . . . . doctus et perurbanus"; cf. *De Fin.* 1. 7. If we say, as some<sup>2</sup> do, that Cicero, in using this term, is allowing his admiration to warp his judgment, and that in reality Lucilius was not *urbanus*—I am using the word in its technical, stylistic sense—then I fail to see how we can place any dependence whatever on ancient literary criticism; rather must we conclude, it seems to me, that if Lucilius' style had not been essentially that described by the rhetoricians as the plain style, Cicero, on whose testimony chiefly we have to rely for the definition of *urbanus* as a quality of this style, would not have employed the term. Cicero, however, is not alone in ascribing this quality to the style of Lucilius. According to Porphyry. *ad. Hor.* S. 1. 10. 53, "comis autem Lucilius dicitur propter urbanitatem," and again, *ad S.* 1. 3. 40: "Luciliana urbanitate usus in transitu amaritudinem aspersit." Furthermore, no less an authority than Varro, as we learn from Gell. 6. 14. 6, made Lucilius the representative of *gracilitas*, meaning thereby *Χαρακτήρ ἰσχνός*; so, also, Fronto, p. 113, N. We know, moreover, that the stylistic code of the small group of orators known as Atticists represents a tradition<sup>3</sup> of grammatical-rhetorical study which began with the circle of the Scipios; that this circle "was throughout under the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Hendrickson, *op. cit.*, p. 103; Jackson, p. 134; Ullman, pp. 287 ff.

<sup>2</sup> So Hendrickson, *Gildersleeve Studies*, p. 160, note, and p. 156.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Hendrickson, *Class. Phil.*, I, 100 ff.; esp. p. 102, n. 2.

influence of Stoic teachers from whom they derived their general attitude toward style—their sobriety and restraint and their aversion to rhetorical exuberance.” The goal of this circle was *Latine loqui*, and they recognized “the conversational idiom as the only true and natural form of speech.”<sup>1</sup> To this circle of the Scipios, Lucilius belonged, and he represented its ideals in his attacks upon the bombastic and turgid productions of the epic and tragic poets, and, I may add, in his ridicule of the excessive use of Greek words and constructions, both in ordinary conversation and in oratory.<sup>2</sup> He was, also, one of that generation of which we read in Cic. *Brut.* 258, giving the views of Caesar, “mitto C. Laelium, P. Scipionem: aetatis illius ista fuit laus tamquam innocentiae sic Latine loquendi, nec omnium tamen, nam illorum aequalis Caecilius et Pacuvius male locutos videmus.” And the latter of these two poets, it should be noted, Lucilius attacked on that very ground; fr. 875 M: “verum tristis contorto aliquo ex Pacuviano exordio”; cf. Gell. 17. 21. 49: “et Pacuvius, et Pacuvius iam sene Accius, clariorque tunc in poematis eorum obtrectandis Lucilius fuit.”

Here, then, arises, if we follow the argument of Professor Ullman, a curious situation. Lucilius, a member of the circle of the Scipios, and their representative in his writings, the satirist of the rhetorical exuberance and Greek affectation of his day, whom Varro selected as a type of the plain style, becomes sixty years after his death the idol of the Asiatics, who stood for every ideal of style which this circle and its offspring, the Atticists, despised. But “Lucilius was more or less of an Asiatic compared with the higher standards of Horace’s day” (Ullman, p. 291, n. 3), and Horace attacks these Asiatics and “their idol Lucilius for their grandiloquent qualities—verbosity, savage invective, obscurity, impurity of diction, inurbane rhetoric, exuberance, turgidity, ineptness” (Ullman, p. 295). One wonders, if this is true, how Lucilius ever came to be admitted to the circle of the Scipios, or why Horace, “the Atticist,” ever chose him to be his model, and made up his mind to write “Lucili ritu, nostrum melioris utroque” (S. 2. 1. 29); how he could call him *facetus* (1. 4. 7), an adjective which he applied to Vergil, “the Atticist,”<sup>3</sup> in 1. 10. 44,

<sup>1</sup> Hendrickson, *ibid.*, pp. 101–2.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Jackson, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. fr. 84 f., and the notes of Marx.

"emunctae naris" (1. 4. 8), and confess himself "infra Lucili censum ingeniumque" (2. 1. 75), or say, "neque ego illi detrudere ausim / haerentem capiti cum multa laude coronam"<sup>1</sup> (1. 10. 48). One wonders, too, if Lucilius was an Asiatic in comparison with the standards of Horace's day how the Atticists could ever have claimed descent from the circle of which he was an honored member, how Caesar could have written as he did—cf. the passage from Cicero quoted above—and how the Atticists could have considered Plautus, whom Horace criticizes just as he criticizes Lucilius, and others of the earlier poets to whom Horace is not friendly,<sup>2</sup> models of pure *Latinitas*. The conclusion to which this argument brings us is not as clear as we should like.

Let us see, then, whether the matter is any better in regard to Catullus. He was a "leading Atticist," we are told, and because he was an Atticist employed the plain style in his shorter poems, at least, and also sets forth the reasons for the faith that was in him (cf. Ullman, pp. 292 ff.). Certainly Catullus, like Horace, employs the plain style in his shorter poems, but have we the right to call a poet an Atticist because in one department of his work, and this lyric poetry which tells the history of his heart, he uses simple and direct speech? How else wrote those old Greek poets from whom he drew his inspiration—Sappho, Alcaeus, Simonides? How else have written the greatest lyric poets of our modern world, Heine, for example, and Burns? Even if we refuse to recognize the claims of a poet's soul, we may recognize, at least, the claims of the department, claims which must never be overlooked in a discussion of ancient literary style. If Catullus' choice of a simple style was due solely to theory, what became of that theory when he set himself to translate Callimachus? or when he coins those bold words<sup>3</sup> which we find chiefly in his longer poems but which are not wanting in his

<sup>1</sup> In view of this line, and for other reasons, I have never been able to accept the conclusion of Professor Hendrickson, *Gildersleeve Studies*, p. 163, that in the tenth satire "Horace's criticism of Lucilius is sweeping and uncompromising."

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Ep.* 2. 1. 28 f., 170; *Ars Poet.* 45 f., passages in which he is clearly taking issue with the tenets of the so-called Atticists, especially their appeal to the *auctoritas* of the older writers.

<sup>3</sup> Fondness for rare words was characteristic of the Alexandrian poets generally; cf. Ellis, *Comm. on Catullus*, p. xxx.

shorter lyrics, *buxifer*, 4. 13, *laserpicifer*, 7. 4, *pinnipes*, *plumipes*, 55. 17. 19? What must the real Atticist, Caesar, have thought of such words—he who said, “habe semper in memoria atque pectore ut tamquam scopulum sic fugias inauditum et insolens verbum” (Gell. 1. 10. 4)? If Catullus demanded brevity because he was an Atticist, what about Propertius, what about the Alexandrian poets, Callimachus, whose dictum, μέγα βιβλίον μέγα κακόν, is echoed by Catullus, 95. 8, “parva mei mihi sint cordi monumenta sodalis,” Lycophron, Aratus? If Catullus avoided Greek words because he was an Atticist, what about Cicero, who in his speeches especially shows the same restraint?<sup>1</sup> If Catullus was *urbanus* in a stylistic sense in his satiric poems and *ridiculus* because he was an Atticist, what about Cicero, whose letters, yes, and whose speeches, show the same qualities? The importance of Catullus and his school for the artistic development of Latin poetry cannot be overestimated, and Horace should have acknowledged the debt which he owed them; but to say that Catullus and Horace wrote as they did because they were Atticists, because they were exponents of certain grammatical-rhetorical theories, is to do violence to the laws of logic and to disregard the claims of art.

Let us, therefore, put out of our minds the idea that Horace in the tenth satire is defending the theories of the Atticists, among whom he and Catullus and Vergil are to be enrolled, and attacking the Asiatics and their model Lucilius for their sins against the canons of stylistic (Atticistic) theory. Let us say, rather, that Horace is demanding the cultivation of clear and refined speech and, in the domain of literature, of suitable artistic form. This enables us to include with him, not only all the writers—we may except Maecenas—whom Horace calls his friends in S. 1. 10. 41 ff., but all the great Latin stylists of his own and the preceding generations. But Lucilius, we are now told, would not, in the judgment of Horace and his fellow Atticists, have had a place among them. He did, however, have a place in the circle of the Scipios, the cradle of the theories of the Atticists of later days, and this, we may be sure, would not have been the case had his literary ideals been different from those of its leaders, whom the Atticists revered as models of pure *Latinitas*.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Weise, *Charakteristik d. Lat. Sprache*, p. 148; Norden, *Kunstprosa*, II, 193.

It is not, therefore, in the quarrel between the Atticists, represented by Horace and Catullus in their demand for a natural style, and the Asiatics, represented by Hermogenes and Lucilius in their advocacy of an unnatural style, that we are to find the explanation of Horace's criticism of Lucilius. As far, indeed, as the kind of style suitable for satire is concerned Horace agrees with Lucilius, and plainly tells us that he follows his master in the use of a style very close to that of ordinary conversation. Nor was the choice of such a style as the vehicle for the *sermoni propiora*, which form the subject-matter of Horace's *Sermones* as well as Lucilius' *Saturae*, dictated by their participation in any quarrel between rhetorical theorists. Lucilius adopted this style, and Horace after him, because the department as well as good taste demanded it, just as the New Comedy demanded it, just as the intercourse of cultured Roman gentlemen demanded it, just as the philosophical dialogue demanded it. This was the style which Ennius employed in his *Saturae*, if we may judge from what we know of their subject-matter. It is difficult, at least, to imagine that he told his fables—a characteristic of the department, as Horace shows—in the grand style. Nothing, indeed, could be *brevius, elegantius, urbanius, simplicius in propriis usitatisque verbis*, to quote a few adjectives from Cicero on the plain style (Or. 80), than the fable of the Crested Lark; and Gellius, 2. 29. 20, recognized it, for his comment is, "hunc Aesopi apologum Q. Ennius in satiris scite admodum et venuste versibus quadratis composuit," a comment which might well have come from a handbook on the plain style. If, moreover, Lucilius was free in his use of Greek words in his satires, we must remember that he criticized the use of them in other spheres, and we may conclude that in this matter, also, he was following a tradition of the department which crops up again in Varro.

With these considerations in mind we can easily understand Horace's criticism of Lucilius and the criticism of Horace by those who claimed Lucilius as their ideal satirist. Horace criticized Lucilius, not for all the faults set forth in the quotation from Professor Ullman, but first and foremost because he was *durus componere versus* (S. 1. 4. 8), because he lacked artistic finish. This includes *brevitas*, that "condensation of style which is secured by the selection of words that carry the meaning adequately" (Morris on



S. 1. 10. 9). On the same ground he attacks Plautus and Ennius and the older writers generally, thereby differing, as we have seen, from the real Atticists; he had been to school to the Alexandrians. In regard to Lucilius' use of Greek words, the criticism of Horace is hardly noticeable; he does not, indeed, attack him directly on this point as he does on the other, but he does attack the imitators of Lucilius, and also lays special emphasis on the necessity of avoiding Greek words in speeches, thus putting himself on the side of Lucilius and Cicero as well as on the side of Messala.

The only other ground on which Horace criticizes Lucilius is this, that he was bitter in his invective, in his direct personal attacks, in his outspoken abuse of public men, wherein he followed the writers of the Old Comedy. The rôle of political satirist was, of course, denied Horace, even if he had been inclined to assume it, and bitter personal attack was foreign to the refined circles in which he moved and repulsive to his own gentle nature. Hence he is careful to make clear (S. 1. 4 and 2. 1) that, although he follows Lucilius as his master in general, he does not follow him in his rôle of public prosecutor.<sup>1</sup> From this point of view S. 1. 10. 7 ff. is perfectly clear and may be paraphrased as follows: When one treats of such diverse subjects as find a place in the rambling discourse of Lucilius and myself, one needs to employ a diverse style; he needs to be *tristis*, certainly, severe in words and thought and style; that is, he must now and then play the part of the orator and the poet, but, like them, he must also be genial, even witty (*iocosus*) at times, gentlemanly and refined (*urbanus*), tempering the severe. Wit, you know, is more potent in many cases than severity. The poets of the Old Comedy realized this, although they are often severe and furnish Lucilius warrant<sup>2</sup> for his severity (compare what I said in my second *sermo*). And it is to this quality of genial wit (please notice the emphasis I lay on this point) that they owe their success. But I am talking about something of which you have no knowledge, for you have never read them. You get your idea of their style, you, Hermogenes, and you, you jackanapes—to give you a taste of your own medicine—from

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the fine analysis by Hendrickson, *AJP*, XXI (1900), 131 ff.; Morris' notes on S. 2. 1. 40, 47–56, 68.

<sup>2</sup> This is also the interpretation of Hendrickson, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

Lucilius, who follows them in their freedom of personal attack, or from Calvus and Catullus, who follow Lucilius in this matter.

That this is the proper interpretation of vs. 19 we see when we consider the criticisms leveled against Horace. What these were he tells us in S. 2. 1. 1 ff.: "sunt quibus in satira videor nimis acer et ultra/legem tendere opus; sine nervis altera, quicquid/composui, pars esse putat, similisque meorum/mille die versus deduci posse." To some people, then, Horace, or, if we follow Professor Hendrickson, *op. cit.*, p. 132, Horace representing the abstract satirist, seemed to be too bitter (cf. the same use of *acer* in 1. 10. 14), exactly what he criticizes Lucilius for having been. These are the critics with whom he deals in S. 1. 4, men to whom "suspectum genus hoc scribendi" (65), who said to him, "laedere gaudes . . . et hoc studio pravus facis" (79), and charged him with being one "absentem qui rodit, amicum qui non defendit alio culpante, solutos/qui captat risus hominum famamque didacis" (81 f.)—objections which repeat vs. 34 of the same satire. The last charge, be it noted, is exactly that which by implication he brings against Lucilius in 1. 10. 7, "non satis est risu diducere rictum/auditoris." These critics of Horace, therefore, blame him for the same faults which he finds in Lucilius, namely, the violation of the "decent reserves of social intercourse by publishing his strictures upon individuals" (Morris' note on 1. 4. 34); to them, in short, he was not refined enough, not *comis et urbanus liberque*, 1. 4. 90, with which compare the *urbanus* of 1. 10. 13, and the *comis et urbanus* of 1. 10. 65. Clearly we are not dealing with the qualities of the plain style in the former passage. Horace's reply, given in the fourth satire, is that these critics are not consistent; that they admit that a man can be *comis et urbanus* in spite of the fact that now and then he will play pranks on a guest at a dinner, or talk too freely when in his cups (86 f.), but deny that a man can be *comis et urbanus* and indulge in the freedom of speech and the jests in which he indulges, vss. 103-5: "liberius si / dixero quid, si forte iocosius, hoc mihi iuris / cum venia dabis"; cf. the *iocosus* of 1. 10. 11.

To another class of critics, however, Horace seemed to be anything but *acer*. You are not bitter enough, they said to him, or personal enough to suit us, and verses such as you make anyone can spin out by the yard. Why don't you hale to court "primores populi

populumque tributim," as Lucilius did, and Calvus and Catullus? Why don't you give us some of the *triste*, the *acre*? These are the critics to whom Horace replies in S. 1. 10, and his reply is in effect: "Times have changed, social ideals have changed, and I am not writing to salt down the city. Lucilius is my master, yes, but he wrote too carelessly to suit me and I do not like his unrefined attacks on individuals. I shall try to write more carefully than he wrote; he himself would be more careful if he were alive today, and I shall adopt a more genial tone, and the result, I hope, will meet the approval of the most polished gentlemen of my day; what you may think of it doesn't bother me in the least."

If this interpretation is correct, it follows that not only can Calvus and Catullus be classified with Lucilius in regard to their view of satire, but they must be. It is satire of which Horace is writing, and especially satire as a weapon of personal attack, and if he criticizes Lucilius for being too *tristis*, for his "indifference to the claims of personal feeling" (Sellar, p. 234), what must he have thought of Catullus and his bitter and unrefined attacks? of such verses as "Ametina . . . ista turpiculo puella naso" (41), "Porci et Socratio . . . scabies famesque mundi" (47), "moecha putida . . . putida moecha . . . O lutum, lupanar" (42); cf. *putide Victa* (98), or of such poems as 29, 37, 54, and others too vulgar for polite society of our day as they were too vulgar for Horace? The distinguishing mark of them all is brutal invective, the presence of which in the writings of Lucilius, Horace condemns. This is one point, at least, of those discussed in this tenth satire, but it is the most vital point, in reference to which Catullus and Horace are decidedly not "entirely in harmony." That Catullus and Lucilius, on the other hand, were in harmony on this point a few passages from the latter's *Saturae* will prove; I cite from the edition of Marx, fr. 66: "homo inpuratus: et inpuno est ne rapister"; 75: "vivite lurcones, comedones, vivite ventris"; 493: "in numero quorum nunc primus Trebellius multost / Lucius, narce, saeva i febris, senium, vomitum, pus"; 1238: "O Publi, O gurges Galloni; cf. 413 f., and the evidence for his *obsenitas* cited by Marx, *Prolog.* p. cxxxiii. In regard to Calvus, we cannot decide definitely owing to our scanty fragments, but the little that we have of his epigrams is strong evidence that in the matter of the use of

personal invective he is to be classed with Lucilius and Catullus and not with Horace. We know that like Catullus he made a violent attack upon Caesar, whom he calls *pedicator* (fr. 17 B), and on Pompey: "Magnus quem metuunt omnes, digito caput uno / scalpit: quid credas hunc sibi velle? virum" (fr. 18); and on Tigellius: "Sardi Tigelli putidum caput venit" (fr. 3). In the *putidum* of this verse Professor Ullman, p. 291, is inclined to see a reference to the "*Asiatic tendency of Tigellius*," but this would hardly apply to the *putida moecha* of Catullus; not, at least, in a literary sense. We must conclude, then, it seems to me, that in the open and vulgar ridicule of individuals, in this direct personal satire, Lucilius, Calvus, and Catullus were in complete agreement, and that Horace missed in their abuse of their contemporaries the self-restraint and subtle irony which pervade his own *Sermones*. He had begun his work<sup>1</sup> in their vein, and such a production as S. 1. 7 must have satisfied even those who made Lucilius their model, but the impulse did not last long, and in later years he could look back and laugh at these *tristes versus* (cf. S. 2. 1. 21) of his apprenticeship.

In the light of this interpretation of the attitude of Horace toward these three poets and their preference for the *acre*, bitter attack, to the *ridiculum*, genial fun—which is the only point discussed in vss. 1–19—vs. 19 itself is perfectly clear. Hermogenes and the *simius* have never read the *prisca comoedia* and hence do not know that it is characterized by the *ridiculum* as well as by the *acre*. They could not know this since their authorities are Lucilius, who imitates the *comoedia* in its *acre* but not in its *ridiculum*, and Calvus and Catullus who, in this matter, follow him, and are as brutal and unsparing in their personal attacks as he.<sup>2</sup> No recourse to irony is necessary, no violent

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the remarks of Hendrickson, *AJP*, XXI, 122. So *pus* in 1. 7.1 recalls Lucilius cited above.

<sup>2</sup> In view of Professor Ullman's suggestion, p. 276, that another point at issue between Horace and Hermogenes may have been the fact that the latter was a Stoic, it may not be amiss to note that as a Stoic he probably shared with his fellows their fondness "*suo quamque rem nomine appellare*," Cic. *Ad. Fam.* 9. 22. 1; he would, therefore, have found the poetry of these three men all the more to his liking. This practice was distasteful to both Cicero and Horace, and there is striking similarity between the former's advice to an orator concerning the use of the *ridiculum*, Or. 88, and the passage under discussion from Horace.

interpretation of *cantare* which is used in its ordinary sense as the frequentative from *cano*, just as it is used in S. 2. 1. 46, "insignis tota cantabitur urbe." There is, however, no unfavorable connotation, as Professor Ullman maintains, in the latter passage; it means simply, as Professor Morris puts it, that everyone will be repeating the satirical verses which Horace will write about him. It is exactly the same use which we have in Ovid, *Am.* 1. 15. 13: "Battiades semper toto cantabitur orbe." From this point of view, also, it makes no difference whether or not we identify the Hermogenes of vs. 18 with the Tigellius of S. 1. 2. 3, and 1. 3. 3, although personally I cannot see why Horace is so careful to call the former Hermogenes unless he wished to distinguish them or, at least, to make their identity less marked. Let it be granted, however, that the two are, as Professor Ullman asserts, identical. Tigellius, then, was dead some years before this tenth satire was written, and since Hermogenes is clearly spoken of as living in this satire—there can be no doubt about vs. 90, hence no doubt about vss. 18, 80—the reference is not specific; Hermogenes, like most of the names in Horace, is not an individual but a type, and neither the friendship of the specific Tigellius for Octavius, nor his enmity with Calvus, need enter into the discussion at all.

The tenth satire, therefore, to sum up, was not written with definite reference to the dispute between the Atticists and the Asiatics, nor is it an attack upon the latter because they combated certain theories, concerning chiefly, if not solely, the style of oratory advocated by the former. Rather is it like the fourth, a statement first of all of Horace's idea of satire and of his relations to Lucilius. The latter was his master, and like him Horace wrote *sermoni propiora*, and in an easy conversational style suitable to the subject-matter and differing from prose only in its form. Lucilius, however, had two great faults: he was too diffuse, too careless of the artistic effect, and too brutal, too personal in his attacks on individuals; these two faults Horace made it his aim to avoid. These two satires serve, also, as replies to those who criticized Horace's idea of satire; in the fourth he answers those who charged him, or satirists as a class, with being too bitter in his attacks on individuals; in the tenth he replies

to those who complained that he was not bitter enough. To the latter, satire meant an unsparing arraignment of conditions and of men, and this they found in the open and often brutal invective of Lucilius, Calvus, and Catullus. They would not or could not realize that Horace was not writing *saturae* but *sermones*, and that he purposely avoided that feature which, owing to Lucilius, had become a marked characteristic of the old literary form known as *satura*.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT